

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 91-107 are canceled herein.
- Claims 1, 15, 49, 73, and 77 are amended herein.
- Accordingly, claims 1-13, 15-47, 49-71, 73-75, and 77-89 remain pending.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 15, 49, 73, and 77 is found in the specification, as originally filed, at least at page 44, line 1 through page 47, line 3 and in Figure 4. The amendments submitted herein do not introduce any new matter.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Thompson:** Thompson, Chris, "DirectShow for Media Playback In Windows", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at <<http://www.flipcode.com/archives/DirectShow_For_Media_Playback_In_Windows-Part_I_Basics.shtml>>, Parts 1-3, Last Part Dated 9-13-200, 18 pages
- **Taymans:** Taymans, et al., "GStreamer Application Development Manual", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at <<<http://www.gstreamer.net/docs/gstreamer-manual.pdf>>>, Archived 4-5-2003, pp i-iv and 1-84
- **Manrique:** Manrique, David "X Window System Architecture Overview HOWTO", 5/22/2001, retrived at <<<http://tidp.org/HOWTP/XWindow-Overview-HOWTO/>>> on 6/20/2010
- **Blome:** Blome, et al., "Core Media Technology in Windows XP Empowers You to Create Custom Audio/Video Processing Components", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at

<<<http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/magazine/cc301631.aspx>>>, MSDN Magazine, 16 pages

- **Smith:** Smith, Leland, "EvCode.h", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at <<<http://www.lelandnsmith.com/downloads/Microsoft/DirectX%209%20SDK/sdk/include/evcode.h>>>, Microsoft, 2001, pp 1-6

102/103 Rejection of Claims 77-82, 85, 86, 88, and 89

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 77-82, 85, 86, 88, and 89 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Thompson. On that same page, the Examiner acknowledges that Thompson does not teach or suggest all of the recitations of claim 77 and cites Manrique as curing the deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicants will respond in the understanding that the Examiner meant to reject claims 77-82, 85, 86, 88, and 89 under 103(a) based on Thompson in view of Manrique rather than under 102(b) based on Thompson alone.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

Independent Claim 77

Claim 77, as amended herein, recites, in part:

first and second computing devices; and
a media engine distributed among and implemented in the first and second computing devices and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation on the first computing device, the first and second computing devices being remote from each other, the media engine implemented in the first computing device being configured to:

use one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content; and

first partially resolve a topology that is to be utilized to present the presentation, and then cause a full topology to be resolved and activated, and

the media engine implemented in the second computing device being configured to use:

one or more transforms communicatively linked with one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources; and

one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream.

In contrast, Thompson simply teaches that the DirectShow media streaming layer may receive the media it streams from a remote device/URL (see page 17 of Thompson). Manrique teaches a client-server architecture for the X Windows System where out of a visualization program on an SGI server is presented on a separate workstation's screen (section 3). The Examiner equates these teachings of Manrique to the recitations of previous claim 1, which recited that the media engine resides on one computing device and the presentation is presented on another.

In response, claim 77 has been amended to recite that the media engine is "distributed among and implemented in" first and second computing devices. These devices are further recited to be remote from each other, and one of the devices has a presentation presented on it by the media engine and an application. Nothing in Thompson and Manrique teaches or suggests a media engine that is "distributed among and implemented in ... first and second computing devices." Rather, in the combined references, the media engine is

always implemented on one device, either the device presenting the presentation or another device remote from that one.

Also, claim 77 has been amended to recite that the media engine implemented on the first computing device is configured to use “one or more media sources ... as a source of media content” and to resolve topologies and the media engine implemented on the second computing device is configured to use “one or more transforms” and “one or more media sinks.” As mentioned above, the cited documents make no mention of a media engine distributed among and implemented on multiple computing devices. It follows, then, that the cited documents do not teach or suggest a media engine configured to use some features in one computing device and other features in another. Thus, for at least these additional reasons, claim 77 is patentable over Thompson and Manrique.

Applicant further notes that the new recitations of claim 77 have not been presented in previous versions of the claims and thus have not been rejected by the Examiner.

For at least the reasons presented herein, Thompson and Manrique do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 77. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 77 is patentable over Thompson and Manrique, and respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 102/103 rejection of claim 77.

Dependent Claims 78-82, 85, 86, 88, and 89

Claims 78-82, 85, 86, 88, and 89 ultimately depend from independent claim 77. As discussed above, claim 77 is patentable over Thompson and Manrique and is therefore allowable over the combined cited documents. Therefore, claims 78-82, 85, 86, 88, and 89 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent Claims 83, 84, and 87

Claims 83, 84, and 87 ultimately depend from independent claim 77. As discussed above, claim 77 is allowable over Thompson and Manrique. Manrique is cited for its alleged teaching of the respective features of dependent claim 87. Manrique and Blome are cited for their alleged teaching of the respective features of dependent claims 83 and 84. However, Blome fails to remedy the deficiencies of Thompson and Manrique as noted above with regard to independent claim 77. Therefore, claims 83, 84, and 87 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 83, 84, and 87.

103 Rejection of Claims 1-9, 49-51, 53-64, 69-71 and 73-75

Claims 1-9, 49-51, 53-64, 69-71 and 73-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Taymans and further in view of Manrique. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites, in part:

first and second computing devices; and
a media engine distributed among and implemented in the first and second computing devices and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation on the first computing device, the first and second computing devices being remote from each other, the media engine being configured to use:
one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content;
one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources; and
one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream.

In contrast, Taymans simply teaches the GStreamer set of programming tools for creating streaming media applications, the tools including an element ("httpsrc") enabling content to be retrieved from a web page (see pages 5 and 34). As mentioned above, Manrique teaches a client-server architecture for the X Windows System where out of a visualization program on an SGI server is presented on a separate workstation's screen (section 3). The Examiner equates these teachings of Manrique to

the previous recitations of claim 1, which recited that the media engine resides on one computing device and the presentation is presented on another.

In response, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the media engine is “distributed among and implemented in” first and second computing devices. These devices are further recited to be remote from each other, and one of the devices has a presentation presented on it by the media engine and an application. Nothing in Taymans and Manrique teaches or suggests a media engine that is “distributed among and implemented in ... first and second computing devices.” Rather, in the combined references, the media engine is always implemented on one device, either the device presenting the presentation or another device remote from that one.

Applicant further notes that the new recitations of claim 1 have not been presented in previous versions of the claims and thus have not been rejected by the Examiner.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Taymans and Manrique do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 1.

Independent Claims 49 and 73

Claims 49 and 73 are patentable over the cited documents at least for reasons similar to those given above with regard to claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-9, 50, 51, 53-64, 69-71, 74, and 75

Claims 2-9, 50, 51, 53-64, 69-71, 74, and 75 each ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1, 49, and 73. As discussed above, claims 1, 49, and 73 are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-9, 50, 51, 53-64, 69-71, 74, and 75 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 2-9, 50, 51, 53-64, 69-71, 74, and 75.

Dependent Claims 52 and 65-68

Claims 52 and 65-68 ultimately depend from independent claim 49. As discussed above, claim 49 is allowable over the combination of Taymans and Manrique. Official Notice is cited for its alleged teaching of the respective features of dependent claim 52. Smith is cited for its alleged teaching of the respective features of dependent claims 65-68. However, Official Notice and Smith fail to remedy the deficiencies of Taymans and Manrique as noted above with regard to independent claim 49. Therefore, claims 52 and 65-68 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 52 and 65-68.

103 Rejection of Claims 10-13, 15-36, 41, 43 and 47

Claims 10-13, 15-36, 41, 43 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Taymans and Manrique, and further in view of Blome. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

Independent Claim 15

Claim 15 is patentable over Taymans and Manrique at least for reasons similar to those given above with regard to claim 1. Blome does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Taymans and Manrique and is not cited as doing so. Rather, Blome is simply cited for the additional recitations of claim 15 not found in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 15 is patentable even over Taymans, Manrique, and Blome.

Dependent Claims 10-13, 16-36, 41, 43 and 47

Claims 10-13, 16-36, 41, 43 and 47 each ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1 and 15. As discussed above, claims 1 and 15 are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 10-13, 16-36, 41, 43 and 47 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 10-13, 16-36, 41, 43 and 47.

Dependent Claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46

Claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46 ultimately depend from independent claim 15. As discussed above, claim 15 is allowable over the combination of Taymans, Manrique and Blome. Smith is cited for its alleged teaching of the respective features of dependent claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46. However, Smith fails to remedy the deficiencies of Taymans, Manrique and Blome as noted above with regard to independent claim 15. Therefore, claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck, Reg. No. 56826/

Dated: 08/24/2010

Robert C. Peck
(robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826

Andy M. Han
Registration No. 60266